

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 1-9 remain in this application and, as amended herein, are submitted for the Examiner's reconsideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1 and 4-9 were rejected 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishihara (U.S. Patent No. 5,134,405) in view of Kuth (U.S. Patent No. 5,514,833). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on references.

As amended herein, claim 1 calls for:

means for displaying a radiation diagram associated with the tool based on the video display signal, said means for displaying the radiation diagram including a display screen and being entirely disposed inside the anechoic chamber to enable the person handling the tool to observe how the handling of the tool affects its electromagnetic behavior.

Neither Ishihara nor Kuth discloses or suggests means for displaying a radiation diagram including a display screen and being entirely disposed inside an anechoic chamber.

The Examiner contends that "Ishihara et al. discloses... said means for displaying the radiation diagram being disposed inside the anechoic chamber... ." However, the monitor shown in the Ishihara reference is actually located in a measuring room that is disposed adjacent to the anechoic chamber. (See col.3 ll.58-59.) Moreover, the measuring room is not shielded by the electromagnetic wave absorber panels that line the anechoic chamber and thus cannot serve as an anechoic chamber. (See col.4 ll.11-13.)

The Examiner also acknowledges that "Ishihara et al. does not disclose said means for displaying the radiation diagram including a display screen disposed inside the anechoic chamber." Hence, Ishihara does not disclose or suggest means for displaying the radiation diagram including a display screen

and being entirely disposed inside the anechoic chamber.

Kuth teaches a display arrangement having a projection screen located inside a shielded chamber but having a projection picture tube, an imaging system, deflection mirrors, a portion of the beam path, etc., that are located outside of the shielded chamber. The display arrangement also includes a light-transmissive port formed by a shielded tubular part that allows the beam to pass through the walls of the shielded chamber onto the projection screen. (See Fig., and col.3 11.25-33.) That is, the reference discloses a rather complex arrangement in which a portion of the display arrangement is located inside of the shielded chamber and a portion of the display arrangement is located outside of the shielded chamber, and in which the walls of the shielded chamber are modified to allow images to be displayed on the projection screen. The resulting complexity would not encourage a person of ordinary skill in the relevant art to incorporate such a display arrangement. Therefore, Kuth does not disclose or suggest means for displaying the radiation diagram including a display screen and being entirely disposed inside the anechoic chamber.

Moreover, Ishihara is concerned with an anechoic chamber that is used to carry out electromagnetic measurements of emitting or receiving antennas, whereas Kuth is concerned with a shielded chamber which is not anechoic and which is used with magnetic resonance systems or bio-magnetic measurement systems. Thus, the person of ordinary skill in the relevant art would not look to incorporate the display arrangement of Kuth inside the anechoic chamber of Ishihara because of concerns that the display arrangement would allow electromagnetic echoes and perturbations to occur. The elimination or avoidance of such electromagnetic echoes or perturbations is not a concern with the systems used in Kuth but is critical to the proper operation of the system of Ishihara.

For at least the above reasons, it follows that neither Ishihara nor Kuth, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the apparatus defined in claim 1, and claim 1 is therefore patentably distinct and unobvious over the relied-on references.

Claims 4-9 depend from claim 1 and are therefore distinguishable over the relied-on sections of Ishihara and Kuth for at least the same reasons.

Also, regarding claim 9, Fig. 2 of Ishihara shows an apparatus to be tested disposed atop a table-shaped stand (see col.4 11.24-26) and does not disclose or suggest a seat as defined in the claim. Kuth does not remedy this deficiency.

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ishihara in view of Kuth and further in view of McKivergan (U.S. Patent No. 6,329,953). Applicants submit that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the relied on references.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and are therefore distinguishable over Ishihara and Kuth for at least the same reasons.

McKivergan is not concerned with displaying a radiation diagram associated with a tool, and therefore McKivergan does not address the deficiencies of Ishihara and Kuth.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at

(908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which the Examiner might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: April 10, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ  
Registration No.: 35,342  
LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,  
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP  
600 South Avenue West  
Westfield, New Jersey 07090  
(908) 654-5000  
Attorney for Applicant

862257\_1.DOC